

Application. No. 10/622,981
Amendment. dated 12/4/06
Reply to Office action of 9/5/06

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-19 remain in the application. Claims 1-4 and 6-19 have been amended. Claims 20 and 21 have been canceled.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the Examiner's statement that claims 3-6, 9-11 and 14-21 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicants have rewritten the claims to reflect the Examiner's statement that certain claims are allowable as discussed hereinbelow.

Consequently, amended claim 1 contains the features recited in previous claims 1 to 3. In addition, the phrase "contains a value different from a logical 0" was replaced by the phrase whether --valid data was written--. Support for this phrase can be found in the last paragraph of page 16 and the third paragraph of page 17 of the specification of the instant application. Applicants believe that these amendments clarify the recitation of the invention in claim 1.

The subject matter of previous claims 8 and 9, respectively, has been added to claims 3 and 4 instead of the previously

Application. No. 10/622,981
Amendment. dated 12/4/06
Reply to Office action of 9/5/06

recited subject matter in those claims.

Amended claim 4 corresponds to the previous claim 4 and incorporates all features of the previous claim 1. In addition, the same clarifying language that was added to claim 1 also has been added to claim 4.

Claim 5 remains unchanged.

Claims 6 to 11 correspond to previous claims 6 to 11 and have been amended to refer back to the new independent claim 4.

Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to reflect the claim language of independent claim 4.

Independent method claim 12 has been amended to include the claim limitations of previous claim 14. In addition, claim 12 has been amended to replace the phrase "logical 0" with the phrase "first value". Support for this phrase can be found in the second paragraph of page 9 of the instant specification. Furthermore, the "value different from the first value" has been designated as --second value--. Support for the term "second value" also can be found in the second paragraph of page 9 of the instant specification. The phrase "returning the datum 0" recited in previous claim 14 has been changed to

Application. No. 10/622,981
Amendment. dated 12/4/06
Reply to Office action of 9/5/06

read --returning a predefined datum-- in revised claim 12 as disclosed in the first paragraph of page 11 of the instant specification.

Consequently, claims 13 and 14 have been amended to recite that the first value corresponds to a "logical 0" and the predefined datum corresponds to the "datum 0", respectively.

Claims 15 to 19 have been amended in order to reflect the change in the language of claim 12.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 2; and 12 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chambers (U.S. 6,047,365) in view of Scheuneman (U.S. 4,757,440) in view of Fitch et al. (U.S. 5,056,060) (hereinafter "Fitch") under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

In item 9 on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 7 and 8 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chambers in view of Scheuneman in view of Fitch and further in view of Arnold et al. (U.S. 4,558,176) (hereinafter "Arnold") under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

In item 11 on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 13 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Chambers

Application. No. 10/622,981
Amendment. dated 12/4/06
Reply to Office action of 9/5/06

in view of Fitch and further in view of Wright et al. (U.S.
4,802,218) (hereinafter "Wright") under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

The rejections have been noted and the claims have been
amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention
of the instant application as discussed above.

The rejections are deemed moot in view of the amendments to
the claims as discussed above. Notwithstanding that
applicants believe that all of the claims present in the
instant application are in allowable form, applicants
respectfully disagree with the Examiner's remarks and comments
with respect to the applied prior art.

None of the references applied by the Examiner show a stack
for buffer-storing the data of auxiliary registers and, as a
function of an associated bit, of registers of a register
bank.

In particular and contrary to the opinion of the Examiner,
Chambers does not show a stack at all. Instead, Chambers
shows wavetable sample pages, which are not related to and do
not suggest the storage of registers on a stack at all.

Further, applicants do not believe that a person having

Application. No. 10/622,981
Amendment. dated 12/4/06
Reply to Office action of 9/5/06

ordinary skill in the art would combine the prior art references of Chambers, Fitch, and Scheuneman in the manner suggested by the Examiner as discussed below.

Firstly, Chambers and Fitch relate to systems and methods for accessing data over a bus system of a computer. In contrast, the present invention relates to a microprocessor circuit comprising a control unit accessing registers of the microprocessor circuit. A person of ordinary skill in considering the problem of how to optimize processing performance and energy efficiency of a microprocessor circuit would not consider the prior art references of Chambers and Fitch to be relevant. Even if he would do so, there is no motivation, suggestion, or teaching to combine the prior art references of Chambers, Fitch, and Scheuneman as proposed by the Examiner.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1, 4, or 12. Claims 1, 4, and 12, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1, 4, or 12.

Application. No. 10/622,981
Amendment. dated 12/4/06
Reply to Office action of 9/5/06

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
DEC 04 2006


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


F. Donald Paris (24,054)

FDP/lq/bb

December 4, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101